

anything was on the bill. The issue with regard to the amendment that's before us was substituted, it's not printed in there, that's not a problem. But when you talk about compromise, you talk about dealing with things the way they are. Under the Robinson amendment...and then going forward to some...some point, I guess, down the road. Under the Robinson amendment, you change the definition of an employer, there would be people who currently receive the federal minimum wage or the state minimum wage, rather, who would no longer have to receive that or at least the employer would not be required to pay that because of this change in definition. So, in other words, there would be folks out there who would be better off with no bill at all if you adopt Senator Robinson's amendment, even though there is an increase in there for folks, I guess, that fall above a gross of \$275,000 as an employer. The purpose for the amendment, I don't know, you know, we went through this debate on every stage so far and I guess it's only appropriate to do it now. But it really is one of, I think, fairness, nothing more than that. How do we want to treat our people? We talk about attracting business to this state constantly. We do it by saying that, you know, we want to give economic incentives to businesses so they come here. We do that so that...and we talk about the good work force, the natural resources, the tax climate, everything else, but then you look at our wage scale for employees that aren't covered under the federal standards and what do you see? With the Robinson amendment you see that you don't care about how you treat your minimum wage employees that aren't protected by the federal standard. You don't care about the young people that, through no fault of their own because of where they happen to be placed geographically, don't have the same opportunities in terms of earning a living, in many cases, or earning spending money, however it may be, or earning tuition. It's more than just an issue of taking care of small business. It's an issue of how do we take care of Nebraskans. And I'm a state senator, I'm not an Omaha senator. I happen to live in Omaha. Others happen to live in Lincoln, but it's a state economy. When we pass bills that deal with agriculture, I don't represent any agricultural land in the 7th District. I still vote on it. I still deal with it. I still talk about it. I still make public policy as it relates to that property and I can still make policy and offer bills that deal with young people, old people, minimum wage people, no matter where they happen to be geographically in the state. That's what you're talking about here. You're not just talking about the difference between a \$275,000 employer and one that